

REMARKS

Claims 1-58 stand rejected in the present Office Action, dated February 19, 2007. Applicants have amended claims 1, 18, 36 and 40. No claims have been canceled or added. Accordingly, following the present response, claims 1-58 are pending in the application.

Telephonic Interview

On May 12, 2008, examiner Asghar Bilgrami and the undersigned conducted a telephonic interview. The contents of said interview are incorporated into the remarks, below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

All the independent claims, 1, 18, 36, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilling (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0182447) in view of Schneider et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0235031).

According to the Office Action, “Schilling did not explicitly disclose determining whether the URL input is valid and if invalid, detecting whether said input is a likely candidate for multilingual analysis,....” Office Action, pp. 2-3.

To cure this deficiency of Schilling, the examiner now cites Schneider et al. (having cited in the previous office action U.S. Patent No. 6,976,019 (Davallou)). However, per the telephonic interview, Schneider et al. does not disclose at least one limitation currently added to all the independent claims. For example, claim 1 recites:

In a computing system, a method for providing automatic universal resource locator (URL) analysis in connection with a process implicating a URL input mechanism, comprising:

- receiving URL input from a client computing device;
- determining whether the URL input is valid;
- when the URL input is invalid, detecting whether said input is a likely candidate for multilingual analysis, and if said input is a likely candidate for said multilingual analysis, performing intelligent rules-based analysis including said multilingual analysis, and identifying the invalid aspects of the invalid URL input;
- transforming the invalid aspects of the invalid URL and outputting at least one valid alternative URL based upon said analysis; and
- suggesting at least one of the said alternative URLs;

wherein said detecting whether said input is a likely candidate for multilingual analysis is based on at least one character inside a domain portion of said URL being above a specified code point, and wherein said domain portion does not include a normalized space, and wherein said domain portion includes at least one normalized period but the period is not leading or trailing.

(emphasis added). Direct support for the above recited limitation can be found at least at:

While a variety of rules based choices could be implemented to detect a multilingual domain name, in an exemplary embodiment, the definition for multilingual domain name is:

(1) the input includes at least one character inside the domain portion that has a code point above 0x0080, although a normalized dot is not counted as above 0x0080, (2) the domain portion does not include normalized space and (3) the domain portion includes at least one normalized period (‘.’) but the period is not leading or trailing.

Here, the domain portion refers to the portion before the first normalized forward slash ‘/’ (counting back slashes ‘\’ as well). After that, the portion might be a subdirectory, path or parameters, etc., with which the present invention is not concerned.

It is expensive to check all the characters to see if there is at least one which has code point above 0x0080; also it is not cheap to check for normalized dot ‘.’ and space ‘ ’. Since the dot ‘.’ checking can be used in other places such as DNS name checking, for performance reasons, an object is utilized that quickly tests the URL input, such as a utility COM object or specialized dictionary object. Herein, normalization refers to treating extended ‘.’ and space ‘ ’ the same as its corresponding ASCII value.

If the multilingual domain name definition is met at 400, the autosearch component redirects to NRP 240. Some multilingual domain examples that will redirect to NRP 240 according to this step include: “電気.東京” and “hello.ㄟㄣ”. Some that will not redirect according to this step include: “東京電気.”, “c.i.a.”, “.net”, “OK.” and “Internet Explorer”. Even though the last example, i.e., “Internet Explorer”, might be registered at NRP 240, at this stage 400, only multilingual domains are checked. In such case, after the autosearch component passes “Internet Explorer” through steps 225 and 405, step 415 of the main search logic checks whether the term is a real name, and thus there is still opportunity to resolve “Internet Explorer” later on.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0767/186581.01
Application No.: 10/073,618
Office Action Dated: February 19, 2008

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.111

Specification, p. 15, l. 22 – p. 16, l. 22.

Thus, claim 1 defines over the cited art, as do the other independent claims 18, 36, and 40. Insofar as claims 2-17 and 55, 19-35 and 56, 37-39 and 57, and 41-54 and 58, depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 18, 36, and 40, respectively, they also patentably define over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claims 1-58 under U.S.C. §103(a) over Schiling in view of Schneider et al.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney at 206-902-2461.

Date: June 19, 2008

/ Grzegorz S. Plichta /
Grzegorz S. Plichta
Registration No. 55,541

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439